

Remarks:

In the Office Action mailed July 9, 2003, the Examiner raises the following points:

1. Claim objections (item 2)
2. Rejection of claim 1 in view of Drupsteen US Patent No. 5,856,659 to Drupsteen ("the Drupsteen Patent") under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) (items 3&4 of the detailed action)
3. Claim rejections in view of the Drupsteen patent under 35 U.S.C 3 (items 5&6 of the detailed action)

Re point 1: claim objections

We have modified the claims 1 to 3 taking into account all the examiner objections.

We also have modified current claim 1. New claim 1 includes the content of the current claim 2.

Amended claim 3 (new claim 2) refers now to a single claim, namely claim 1.

Re point 2: Claim rejections under Drupsteen – Novelty of new claims 1

New claim 1 includes the content of the current claim 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted the Drupsteen patent does not anticipate new independent claim 1 as currently amended.

Re point 3: Claim rejections in view of Drupsteen US 5.856 659 under 35 U.S.C 3

The Drupsteen patent, col. 5 lines 42-47, describes that transfer commands may comprise a flag to indicate the nature of the transferred data (commands or other data) and their destination (memory or instruction register).

It's clear that the flag as described in the Drupsteen patent has not the same function as our flag FLG (see the Drupsteen patent col.5 lines 42-47).

The examiner concludes that "it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the flag indicating the status/nature of the data in order to implement the flag to indicate the loading states (Y or N) of the portable object ... to verify if the portable object (card) has been loaded with desired data. "

Nevertheless, the Drupsteen patent doesn't divulge any flag as defined in our invention (see new claim 1).

In our invention, there are means FLG in the portable object which indicate to ANY transmitting devices EMj the loading state FLG = Y or non-loading state FLG = N, of the portable object. So that, with our invention, if the dialog between ANY transmitting devices EMj and the card is interrupted, for example in the case where the card leaves the effective electromagnetic field of the transmitter EM1, the loading of a block BLKi is interrupted while the card is still in the loading state FLG = Y.

There is no indication in the Drupsteen patent on how the terminals are informed of an interruption.

As to claim 3, the examiner refers to col. 2 lines 43-50 and col. 6 line 4. These paragraphs DON'T divulge that prior to the resumption of the loading of the block BLKi, the

transmitting device checks a flag as in our claim. According to our invention, EMj then tests the card, to check whether it is in a loading state.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted the Drupsteen patent does not anticipate independent claim 1 as currently amended. As claim 1, dependent claim 2 is not anticipated by the Drupsteen patent.

Application No.
09/622,657

Filing Date
Oct. 16, 2000

Applicant(s)
THIRIET, Fabien

Attorney Docket No.
76.0478 US

Conclusion:

In light of the above, the objections and rejections under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that this application be allowed to issue as a patent.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonard W. Pojunas
Reg. No. 30, 314

ScumbergerSema Inc.
30000 Mill Creek Ave., Suite 100
Alpharetta, GA 30022
Phone: (678) 258-1605
Fax: (678) 258-1686

Application No.
09/622,657

Filing Date
Oct. 16, 2000

Applicant(s)
THIRIET, Fabien

Attorney Docket No.
76.0478 US